

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
OneLink Communications, Inc.)	File No. EB-TCD-13-00007004
)	FRN: 0007539471
)	
TeleDias Communications, Inc.)	File No. EB-TCD-16-00020892
)	FRN: 0007513815
)	
TeleUno, Inc.)	File No. EB-TCD-16-00020893
)	FRN: 0005835558
)	
Cytel, Inc.)	File No. EB-TCD-16-00020894
)	FRN: 0020071205

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Adopted: March 14, 2017**Released: March 14, 2017**

By the Chief, Telecommunications Consumers Division, Enforcement Bureau; and Chief, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. By this Order, we initiate a proceeding to determine whether to revoke the domestic Section 214 authorizations held by OneLink Communications, Inc. (OneLink); TeleDias Communications, Inc. (TeleDias); TeleUno, Inc. (TeleUno); and Cytel, Inc. (Cytel) (collectively, the Companies).¹

II. BACKGROUND

2. The Companies are common carriers and are subject to Title II of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Act). In particular, OneLink, TeleDias, TeleUno, and Cytel are resellers of domestic and international² long distance telecommunications services.³ OneLink operates the Companies as a single enterprise in Alpharetta, Georgia, and provides back office and administrative support for the Companies.⁴

¹ The Companies, like all telecommunications carriers, have blanket Section 214 domestic authority. In 1999, the Commission granted all telecommunications carriers blanket authority under Section 214 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Act), to provide domestic interstate services and to construct or operate any domestic transmission line. *Implementation of Section 402(b)(2)(A) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 et al.*, Report and Order in CC Docket No. 97-11, Second Memorandum Opinion and Order in AAD File No. 98-43, 14 FCC Rcd 11364, 11365–66, para. 2 (1999); 47 CFR § 63.01.

² See ITC-214-20010918-00487 (OneLink); ITC-214-20020808-00394 (TeleDias); ITC-214-20000906-00521 (TeleUno); ITC-214-20100817-00331 (Cytel).

³ *OneLink Communications, Inc., et al*, Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture, 31 FCC Rcd 1403, 1404, para. 4 (2016).

⁴ *Id.*

3. In August 2016, all four Companies notified the Commission that they were surrendering their international Section 214 authorizations, thereby extinguishing their authorizations to provide international telecommunications services.⁵ On August 16, 2016, the California Public Utilities Commission (California PUC) attempted to contact OneLink's counsel regarding a slamming investigation.⁶ OneLink's counsel responded to the California PUC that OneLink no longer existed and thus could not respond to the investigation.⁷

III. DISCUSSION

4. OneLink, which operated all of the Companies as a single enterprise, has represented to the California PUC that it no longer exists. Although this representation would mean that the Companies have ceased to provide certain telecommunications services, the Enforcement Bureau and the Wireline Competition Bureau (collectively, the Bureaus) have found no evidence that the Companies have complied with the statutory and regulatory provisions that must be observed before a carrier may lawfully discontinue a telecommunications service.⁸ As discussed in the next paragraph, the absence of such evidence raises questions regarding the Companies' compliance with other statutory and regulatory requirements, their ongoing qualifications to hold domestic Section 214 authorizations, and whether retention of these authorizations serves the public convenience and necessity.

5. The Bureaus have been unable to confirm that the Companies complied with various statutory and regulatory requirements. For example, the Bureaus have found no evidence that the Companies: (1) filed for discontinuance of domestic telecommunications services as required under Section 214 of the Act and Section 63.71 of the Commission's rules;⁹ (2) updated their registration information to remove California from the list of jurisdictions in which they provide telecommunications service;¹⁰ or (3) filed their FCC Form 499-Qs due on August 1, 2016, November 1, 2016, or February 1, 2017.¹¹

6. Accordingly, we initiate a proceeding to determine whether to revoke the Companies' domestic Section 214 authorizations.¹² This proceeding affords the Companies notice and an opportunity to file a written response providing evidence of their compliance with the foregoing requirements (or an explanation as to why noncompliance was permissible under the Act and the Commission's rules), thereby demonstrating that the public convenience and necessity are served by their retention of their domestic Section 214 authorizations. If the Companies have not complied with the foregoing requirements, they have the opportunity to file a written response describing how they intend to achieve compliance and why the Commission should not revoke their domestic Section 214 authorizations.

7. The Companies must file a response with the Enforcement and Wireline Competition Bureaus within thirty (30) calendar days demonstrating why the Commission should not revoke their

⁵ *International Authorizations Granted*, Public Notice, 31 FCC Rcd 10876, 10880 (IB 2016).

⁶ Letter to OneLink Communications, Inc., from Jeanette Lo, Chief, Utility Enforcement Branch, Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division, California Public Utilities Commission (Sept. 13, 2016).

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ See 47 U.S.C. § 214(a); 47 CFR § 63.71.

⁹ See 47 U.S.C. § 214(a); 47 CFR § 63.71.

¹⁰ See, e.g., Detailed Information for OneLink Communications, Inc., Federal Communications Commission Form 499 Filer Database, <http://apps.fcc.gov/cgb/form499/499detail.cfm?FilerNum=823296> (last visited Mar. 6, 2017) (indicating that the Company provides telecommunications services in California); see also 47 CFR § 64.1195(g); *id.* § 64.1195(b)(5) (requiring the carrier to identify "[t]he states in which the carrier provides telecommunications").

¹¹ See 47 CFR § 54.711(a); *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration, 16 FCC Rcd 5748, 5755, para. 19 (2001).

¹² See 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(j), 403; 47 CFR § 1.1.

domestic Section 214 authorizations. Each company's response must include evidence of current subscribers, revenue, and assets. Failure to respond or submit a response providing a reasonable basis for why the Companies should retain their domestic Section 214 authorizations may result in revocation of the domestic Section 214 authorizations held by the Companies.

IV. CONCLUSION

8. For the reasons set forth above, we initiate this proceeding to determine whether to revoke the domestic Section 214 authorizations held by OneLink, TeleDias, TeleUno, and Cytel. This proceeding affords the Companies notice and an opportunity to file a written response providing evidence of their compliance with the foregoing requirements (or an explanation as to why noncompliance was permissible under the Act and the Commission's rules), thereby demonstrating that retention of their domestic Section 214 authorizations would serve the public convenience and necessity. Each Company's response must include evidence of current subscribers, revenue, and assets. If the Companies have not complied with the foregoing requirements, they have the opportunity to file a written response describing how they intend to achieve compliance and why the Commission should not revoke their domestic Section 214 authorizations.

V. ORDERING CLAUSES

9. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that, pursuant to Sections 4(j) and 403 of the Act and Sections 0.91, 0.111, 0.291, 0.311, 1.1, and 1.102(b)(1) of the Commission's rules,¹³ OneLink Communications, Inc., TeleDias Communications, Inc., TeleUno, Inc., and Cytel, Inc. **SHALL FILE** a written response pursuant to the requests in paragraph 8 within thirty (30) calendar days from the release date of this Order.

10. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that copies of this Order shall be sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to: (1) Michael Donahue and Jane L. Wagner, Marashlian & Donahue, PLLC, attorneys for OneLink Communications, Inc., TeleDias Communications, Inc., TeleUno, Inc., and Cytel, Inc., 1420 Spring Hill Road, Suite 401, McLean, VA 22102; (2) Enrique Martinez, CEO, OneLink Communications, Inc., 8400 N. University Dr., Ste. 204, Tamarac, FL, 33321; (3) OneLink Communications, Inc., c/o CT Corporation System, 1015 15th Street, NW, Ste. 1000, Washington, DC, 20005; (4) Carmen Asorey, CEO, TeleDias Communications, Inc., 1100 California Dr., Ste. 204, Reno, NV, 89509; (5) TeleDias Communications, Inc., c/o CT Corporation System, 1015 15th Street, NW, Ste. 1000, Washington, DC, 20005; (6) Christina Perry, CEO, Cytel Inc., 2700 W Atlantic Blvd., Ste. 280, Pompano Beach, FL, 33069; (7) Cytel, Inc., c/o CT Corporation System, 1015 15th Street, NW, Ste. 1000, Washington, DC, 20005; (8) Avelino Iglesia, CEO, TeleUno, Inc., 2754 W Atlantic Blvd., Ste. 8, Pompano Beach, FL, 33069; (9) TeleUno, Inc., c/o CT Corporation System, 1015 15th Street, NW, Ste. 1000, Washington, DC, 20005.

¹³ 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(j), 403; 47 CFR §§ 0.91, 0.111, 0.291, 0.311, 1.1, 1.102(b)(1).

11. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this Order **SHALL BE POSTED** in the Commission's Office of the Secretary.¹⁴

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Richard A. Hindman
Chief
Telecommunications Consumers Division
Enforcement Bureau

Daniel Kahn
Chief
Competition Policy Division
Wireline Competition Bureau

¹⁴ See 47 CFR § 1.47(h).